

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited.

Claims 1, 2, and 5 are pending, with Claims 1 and 2 being independent. Claim 4 has been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1 and 2 have been amended. The Official Action asked that Applicant provide support for the amendments. In response, Applicant respectfully wishes to direct the Examiner's attention to, e.g., pp. 62, 66-69, and p. 27 and Figs. 40-42, among other places. Of course, the claims are not limited to the disclosed embodiments.

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph, as being indefinite. All rejections are respectfully traversed, and are submitted to have been obviated by the amendment of the claims in a manner earnestly believed to avoid the grounds of rejection, viz, specific antecedent basis for not updating the second data buffer has been added, and the objected-to expression "the data communication" has been revised, thereby addressing the points raised in the Official Action. Claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over US 2003/0182503 A1 (Leong, et al.) in view of US 6,820,187 B2 (Asano, et al.) and newly-cited US 6,185,632 B1 (Berkema). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 2 variously recite, *inter alia*, in the case that the first data buffer is updated and the second data buffer is not updated, a second operation request block which designates third data communication to be performed with the updated first data buffer and fourth data communication to be performed with the non-updated second data buffer is transmitted from the first device to the second device even if the second data communication for the second data buffer has not been completed, the second operation request block including a third identification information for the third data communication to be performed with the updated first data buffer and the second identification information for the fourth data communication to be performed

with the non-updated second data buffer, and wherein the second device further comprises a recognizing unit that (a) recognizes, in accordance with the third identification information, that the third data communication to be performed with the updated first data buffer is performed for transmitting a new data and (b) recognizes, in accordance with the second identification information, that the fourth data communication to be performed with the non-updated second data buffer is performed for retransmitting the second data communication already designated by the first operation request block.

However, Applicant respectfully submits that none of the applied documents, even in the proposed combinations, assuming, *arguendo*, that such could be combined, discloses or suggests at least the above-discussed claimed features as recited, *inter alia*, in Claims 1 and 2.

The Official Action states “note that the first and second data buffers may be accessed by two I/O tasks which do not have corresponding child I/O tasks and thus will not be suspended in order to wait for any child tasks to complete (Leong Fig. 4-5, paragraph 0094).” Applicant respectfully traverses the foregoing. Applicant respectfully traverses the foregoing, and submits that Leong, et al. [0094] (which states, *inter alia*, that the I/O tasks are sent to the I/O stack individually and are scheduled and serviced without regard to their relationship to each other), and Leong, et al.’s discussion of parent and child I/O tasks, is wholly silent at least as regards the above-discussed claimed features as recited, *inter alia*, in Claims 1 and 2.

Applicant respectfully submits that Asano, et al. discloses, e.g., that the DMA controller issues a command completion notice together with the VTID corresponding to the performed command (e.g., col. 10, lines 20-30), but Asano, et al. fails to remedy Leong, et al.’s deficiencies, as does Berkema.

Applicant further respectfully submits that there has been no showing of any indication of motivation in the cited documents that would lead one having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the above-discussed claimed features. By means of such features, Applicant respectfully submits that the second device can process without repeating a process for retransmitting data. Of course, the claims are not limited to the foregoing.

The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable because they set forth additional aspects of the present invention and are dependent from independent claims discussed above. Therefore, separate and individual consideration of each dependent claim is respectfully requested.

Applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Daniel S. Glueck/
Daniel S. Glueck
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 37,838

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
DSG/jjr